arXiv:1507.06684v1 [math.GN] 23 Jul 2015

CARDINALITY BOUNDS INVOLVING THE SKEW-λ LINDELÖF DEGREE AND ITS VARIANTS

N.A. CARLSON AND J.R. PORTER

Abstract. We introduce a modified closing-off argument that results in several improved bounds for the cardinalities of Hausdorff and Urysohn spaces. These bounds involve the cardinal invariant $skL(X,\lambda)$, the skew-λ Lindelöf degree of a space X, where λ is a cardinal. $skL(X,\lambda)$ is a weakening of the Lindelöf degree and is defined as the least cardinal κ such that if $\mathcal{U}$ is an open cover of X then there exists $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that $|X\setminus \cup\, \mathcal{V}| < \lambda$. We show that if X is Hausdorff then $|X| \leq 2^{skL(X,\lambda)t(X)\psi(X)}$, where $\lambda = 2^{t(X)\psi(X)}$. This improves the well-known Arhangel′skiĭ- Šapirovskiĭ bound $2^{L(X)t(X)\psi(X)}$ for the cardinality of a Hausdorff space X. We additionally define several variations of $skL(X,\lambda)$, establish other related cardinality bounds, and provide examples.

1. Introduction and Preliminaries.

Nearly five decades ago, Arhangel'skiĭ [1] established an impressive result by showing that the cardinality of first countable, Lindelöf Hausdorff spaces is no larger than that of the real numbers. More precisely, he proved that for a Hausdorff space X, $|X| \leq 2^{\chi(X)L(X)}$ - the size of an arbitrary Hausdorff space is bounded above by an exponential of two properties - the global Lindelöff degree property $L(X)$ and the local character property $\chi(X)$. Many improvements of this cardinality bound inequality have been published since 1969; most have been presented in an excellent survey paper by Hodel [11].

In this paper, the property of Lindelöf is extended by adding a new dimension that measures how close in cardinality a family of open sets is to covering a space. This additional flexibility in the Lindelöf degree is used to derive new cardinality bounds, and it provides additional insight in understanding why the cardinality bound works. The paper starts with the Main Theorem, a set theoretic result that develops a closing-off argument in a non-topological setting. The proof of the main theorem requires an interesting modification involving a Ramsey-theoretic argument. The Main Theorem is applied in three separate settings; the conclusions in each of these settings improve several classical cardinality bounds.

Dedicated to Filippo Cammaroto, on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 54D20, 54A25, 54D10.

Key words and phrases. cardinality bounds, cardinal invariants.

All spaces considered in this paper are Hausdorff. We assume that the reader is familiar with the usual cardinal functions of L (Lindelöf), χ (character), ψ (pseudo-character), ψ_c (closed pseudo-character), and t (tightness). Our notation and terminology follow [9] for general topological notions, [10, 11, 12] for cardinal functions and [13] for H-closed spaces and H-closed extensions.

For a space X, $\tau(X)$ is used to denote the topology of X. For $A \subseteq X$ and κ an infinite cardinal, let $[A]^{\leq\kappa} = \{B : B \subseteq A, |B| \leq \kappa\}$. The set $cl_\kappa A = \cup\{cl(B) : B \in A]^{\leq\kappa}\}$ is called the *κ-closure of A*; A is *κ-closed* if $cl_\kappa A = A$. It is easy to show that $cl_\kappa A \subseteq clA$ and $cl_\kappa A$ is κ-closed. The set $cl_\theta A = \{p \in X : clU \cap A \neq \varnothing \text{ for } p \in U \in \tau(X)\}$ is called the *θ-closure* of A; A is *θ-closed* if $cl_\theta(A) = A$. It is clear that $clA \subseteq cl_\theta(A)$; however it is not necessarily true that $cl_\theta(cl_\theta(A)) = cl_\theta(A)$.

The first cardinality bound we will improve is the famous Arhangel′skiĭ-Šapirovskiĭ bound of $|X| \leq 2^{L(X)\psi(X)t(X)}$ for a space X (see 2.27 in [12]). This 1974 bound is a modification by Šapirovskiĭ of the 1969 Arhangel′skiĭ bound.

For $A \subseteq X$, the *almost Lindelöf degree* of A relative to X, denoted by $aL(A, X)$, is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that for every open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of A by sets open in X, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that $A \subseteq \cup\{clU : U \in \mathcal{V}\}$. The *almost Lindelöf degree* of X, denoted by $aL(X)$, is $aL(X, X)$. The *almost Lindelöf degree relative to closed subsets of X*, denoted by $aL_c(X)$, is the supremum of the set $\{aL(C, X) : C \text{ closed subset of } X\}$. The next cardinality bound we will improve is the 1988 Bella-Cammaroto bound $2^{aL_c(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)}$ for the cardinality of a space X (see [4]).

For $A \subseteq X$, the *weak Lindelöf degree* of A relative to X, denoted by $wL(A, X)$, is the smallest infinite cardinal κ such that for every open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of A by sets open in X, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that $A \subseteq cl\,(\cup\mathcal{V})$. The *weak Lindelöf degree* of X, denoted by $wL(X)$, is $wL(X, X)$. The *weak Lindelöf degree relative to closed subsets of X*, denoted by $wL_c(X)$, is the supremum of the set $\{wL(C, X) : C \text{ closed subset of } X\}$. The third cardinality bound we will improve is the 1993 Alas bound of $2^{wL_c(X)\chi(X)}$ for the cardinality of an Urysohn space X (see [2]). As $wL(X) = wL_c(X)$ for a normal space X, it follows that $|X| \leq 2^{wL(X)\chi(X)}$ for normals spaces, a result first proved in 1978 by Bell, Ginsburg, and Woods [3].

A basic space that is useful as an example is the Katětov H-closed extension of ω, denoted as $\kappa\omega$. The extension $\kappa\omega$ of ω is both H-closed and Urysohn and is the Stone-Čech compactification of ω with a finer topology; $\tau(\kappa\omega)$ is the largest topology such that $\tau(\beta\omega)$ is the topology generated by the base $\{cl_{\kappa\omega}U : U \in \tau(\kappa\omega)\}$ (see 4.8 in [13] for details). It is known (see [5, 11] or straightforward to compute that $L(\beta\omega) = aL(\beta\omega) =$

$aL_c(\beta\omega) = wL(\beta\omega) = wL_c(\beta\omega) = \omega$, $L(\kappa\omega) = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}, aL(\kappa\omega) = wL(\kappa\omega) = wL_c(\kappa\omega) = \omega, aL_c(\kappa\omega) = \mathfrak{c}$, $t(\beta\omega) = \mathfrak{c}, t(\kappa\omega) = \omega$, $\psi(\beta\omega) = \mathfrak{c}, \psi(\kappa\omega) = \omega$, $\psi_c(\beta\omega) = \psi_c(\kappa\omega) = \mathfrak{c}$, and $\chi(\beta\omega) = \mathfrak{c}, \chi(\kappa\omega) = \omega$

We conclude this section with some results used in the paper.

Proposition 1.1. *Let X be a space, $A \subseteq X$ a closed subset of X, and κ an infinite cardinal. Then*

(a) [11] $\psi_c(X) \leq \psi(X) \cdot L(X)$,
(b) [11] *if X is Urysohn,* $\psi_c(X) \leq \psi(X) \cdot aL_c(X)$,
(c) [5] $t(X) \leq \kappa$ *iff for all* $B \subseteq X, cl_\kappa B = clB$,
(d) [5] *if* $t(X) \leq \kappa$, *then* $aL_\kappa(X) = aL_c(X)$,
(e) [10] *if* $\psi_c(X) \leq \kappa$, *then* $|cl_\kappa A| \leq |A|^{\leq\kappa}$, *and*
(f) [4] *if X is Urysohn and* $\chi(X) \leq \kappa$, *then* $|cl_\theta A| \leq |A|^{\leq\kappa}$.

2. A closing-off argument.

Recall that for a set X and subsets $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$, a function $f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{T}$ is an *operator* if for each $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$ with $A \subseteq B, A \subseteq f(A) \subseteq f(B)$ and a function $h : \mathcal{S} \to X$ is *expansive* if for $A \in \mathcal{S}$, $A \subseteq h(A)$.

We give our Main Theorem below, a closing-off argument giving a bound on the size of a set X. Note that X need not be endowed with a topology and so the argument is entirely set-theoretic. This is not unlike Theorems 3.1 and 3.3, for example, in Hodel's survey paper [11].

Main Theorem. *Let X be a set, κ an infinite cardinal, and $c : [X]^{\leq\kappa} \to [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$ an operator. For each $x \in X$, let $\{V(x,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be a collection of subsets of X satisfying this property:*

(E) *(expansive function) there is an expansive function $h : [\{V(x,\alpha) : x \in X, \alpha < \kappa\}]^{\leq\kappa} \to X : \mathcal{S} \mapsto h(\cup\mathcal{S})$.*

(C-S) *(cover-separation condition) if $\varnothing \neq H \in [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$ and $c(A) \subseteq H$ for all $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$, then for $q \notin H$, there exist $A \in H^{\leq\kappa}$ and a function $f : A \to \kappa$ such that $|H \backslash h(\bigcup_{x<A} V(x, f(x)))| < 2^\kappa$ and $q \notin h(\bigcup_{x\in A} V(x, f(x)))$.*

Then $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$.

Proof. Let $L : \mathcal{P}(X) \to X$ be a choice function. Let $M : [X]^{\geq 2^\kappa} \to [X]^{2^\kappa}$ be a function such that $M(A) \subseteq A$ for all $A \in [X]^{\geq 2^\kappa}$. (That is, for every subset A of X of cardinality at least 2^κ, $M(A)$ is subset of A of cardinality 2^κ). Define $N : \mathcal{P}(X) \to \{\{x\} : x \in X\} \cup [X]^{2^\kappa}$ by

$$N(A) = \begin{cases} \{L(A)\} & A \in [X]^{<2^\kappa} \\ M(A) & A \in [X]^{\geq 2^\kappa} \end{cases}$$

Note that N is function on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ that chooses a point out of a subset A if $A \in [X]^{<2^\kappa}$ and chooses a subset of cardinality 2^κ if $A \in [X]^{\geq 2^\kappa}$. We

construct a sequence $\{H_\alpha : 0 \leq \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ of subsets of X such that for $0 \leq \alpha < \kappa^+$,

(1) $H_0 = N(\varnothing)$
(2) if H_β is defined for $\beta < \alpha$, let

$$K_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta \cup \bigcup\{N(X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A} V(x, f(x)))) : A \in [\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta]^{\leq\kappa}, f : A \to \kappa\}.$$

Define H_α by $H_\alpha = \bigcup\{c(B) : B \in [K_\alpha]^{\leq\kappa}\}$.

Now, for each $A \in [\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta]^{\leq\kappa}$ there are at most $\kappa^\kappa = 2^\kappa$ functions $f : A \to \kappa$. Since $\left|N\left(X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A} V(x, f(x))\right)\right| \leq 2^\kappa$, it follows that $|K_\alpha| \leq 2^\kappa$. For each $B \in [K_\alpha]^{\leq\kappa}$, $|c(B)| \leq 2^\kappa$. It follows that $|H_\alpha| \leq 2^\kappa$. Let $H = \bigcup\{H_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$. Then $|H| \leq 2^\kappa$. Note also that for $B \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$, there exists $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that $B \subseteq H_\alpha \subseteq K_{\alpha+1}$ and thus $c(B) \subseteq H_{\alpha+1} \subseteq H$.

We wish to show that $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$. Suppose by way of contradiction that $|X| > 2^\kappa$. Since $|H| \leq 2^\kappa$, it follows that $|X| > |H|$ and $|X\backslash H| = |X|$.

Fix $q \in X\backslash H$. By **(C-S)**, there exist $A_q \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ and a function $f_q : A_q \to \kappa$ such that $|H\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_q} V(x, f_q(x)))| < 2^\kappa$ and $q \notin h(\bigcup_{x\in A_q} V(x, f_q(x)))$. Thus $h(\bigcup_{x\in A_q} V(x, f_q(x))) \subseteq X\backslash\{q\}$. Also, there exists $\alpha_q < \kappa^+$ such that $A_q \in \left[\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha_q} H_\beta\right]^{\leq\kappa}$.

Now unfix $q \in X\backslash H$. Since $|X\backslash H| = |X| > 2^\kappa \geq \left|[H]^{\leq\kappa}\right|$, there exists $p \in X\backslash H$ and $Y \subseteq X\backslash H$ such that $|Y| = |X\backslash H| = |X|$ and $A_p = A_q$ for all $q \in Y$. Since $|Y| > 2^\kappa$ there is $Z \subseteq Y$ such that $|Z| = |Y| > 2^\kappa$ and $f_r = f_q$ for all $r, q \in Z$.

Thus, for $r \in Z$, $h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))) \subseteq X\backslash\{q\}$ for all $q \in Z$. That is, $h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))) \subseteq X\backslash Z$ or $Z \subseteq X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x)))$. This implies $|X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x)))| > 2^k$ and thus

$$\left|N(X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x)))\right| = 2^k.$$

Since $A_r \subseteq \left[\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha_r} H_\beta\right]^{\leq\kappa}$, it follows that

$$N(X\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))) \subseteq H_{\alpha_r+1}\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))) \subseteq H\backslash h(\bigcup_{x\in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))).$$

Therefore,

$$2^\kappa = \left| N(X \backslash h(\bigcup_{x \in A_r} V(x, f_r(x))) \right| \leq \left| H \backslash h(\bigcup_{x \in A_r} V(x, f_r(x)))) \right| < 2^\kappa.$$

This is a contradiction. Thus, $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$. □

We see that in the above proof, like a traditional closing-off argument, a chain of sets $\{H_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ is inductively constructed and the union $H = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta$ is formed where $|H| \leq 2^\kappa$. But the above proof fundamentally diverges from standard arguments in the way it is shown that $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$ once the construction of $\{H_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ is complete. In a standard argument it is usually shown that $X = H$, and thus $|X| = |H| \leq 2^\kappa$. This is done by supposing there exists a point $q \notin H$ and obtaining a contradiction. Yet, what ultimately needs to be shown is that $|X| = |H|$, not necessarily that $X = H$, and in the above proof only $|X| = |H|$ is shown. This is accomplished by supposing that $|X| > |H|$, using every point $q \notin H$ rather than just one, and obtaining a contradiction. A Ramsey-theoretic relation is used to obtain the homogeneous set Z.

Furthermore, in a traditional argument the chain of sets $\{H_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is constructed whereby at stage α a certain collection of points is added to $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta$. In the above proof however a certain collection of subsets of size 2^κ as well as points is added to $\bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} H_\beta$.

In this paper, the function h will be the identity function or the operator c.

3. The skew-λ Lindelöf degree.

Definition 3.1. Let X be a space, $A \subseteq X$, and λ an infinite cardinal. The *skew-λ Lindelöf degree of A in X*, denoted by $skL(A, X, \lambda)$, is the least infinite cardinal κ such that for every cover $\mathcal{U}$ of A by open sets in X there exists $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq \kappa}$ such that $|A \backslash \bigcup \mathcal{V}| < \lambda$. The *skew-λ Lindelöf degree of X*, denoted by $skL(X, \lambda)$, is $skL(X, X, \lambda)$.

We note that $skL(X, \lambda) \leq L(X)$ for any space X and infinite cardinal λ. Also, as $skL(X, \lambda)$ and λ are both infinite, it follows that $skL(X, \aleph_0) = skL(X, \aleph_1)$. Proposition 3.2(a) demonstrates that the cardinal function $skL(X, \lambda)$ is hereditary on closed subsets for every cardinal λ, and 3.2(b) and is decreasing in terms of λ. Observe that 3.2(e) is an improvement of Proposition 1.1(a). Proposition 3.2(d) gives a straightforward example of a space X such that $skL(X, \lambda) < L(X)$ for a particular cardinal λ. For an infinite discrete space X, $skL(X, \lambda) = \omega$ if $|X| < \lambda^+$ and $skL(X, \lambda) = |X|$ if $|X| \geq \lambda^+$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a space, $C \subseteq X$ a closed subset of X, and λ an infinite cardinal. Then*

(a) $skL(C, \lambda) \leq skL(C, X, \lambda) \leq skL(X, \lambda)$,

(b) *if* $\mu \leq \lambda$, *then* $skL(X,\lambda) \leq skL(X,\mu)$,
(c) $skL(X,\omega) = L(X) \geq skLX,\lambda) \geq skL(X,|X|^+) = \omega$,
(d) *if* Y *is discrete space such that* $|Y| = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $skL(Y \cup \beta\omega, \mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega < \mathfrak{c} = L(Y \cup \beta\omega)$, *and*
(e) $\psi_c(X) \leq \psi(X) \cdot skL(X, \psi(X)^+)$.

Proof. The proof of the first inequality of (a) is straightforward. For the second inequality of (a), let $\kappa = skL(X,\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{U}$ be a cover of C by sets open in X. Then $\{X\backslash C\} \cup \mathcal{U}$ is an open cover of X. There exists $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \{X\backslash C\} \bigcup \mathcal{U}$ such that $|\mathcal{V}| \leq \kappa$ and $|X\backslash \bigcup \mathcal{V}| < \lambda$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{V}\backslash\{X\backslash V\}$. Then $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$, $|\mathcal{W}| \leq \kappa$, and

$$\left|C\backslash \bigcup \mathcal{W}\right| = \left|C\backslash \bigcup \mathcal{V}\right| \leq \left|X\backslash \bigcup \mathcal{V}\right| < \lambda.$$

Thus, $skL(C,X,\lambda) \leq \kappa$. The proofs of (b), (c), and (d) are straightforward. For (e), let $p \in X$, there is a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \tau(X)$ such that $\cap\mathcal{B} = \{p\}$ and $|\mathcal{B}| \leq \psi(X)$. For each $U \in \mathcal{B}$ and $q \in X\backslash U$, there is an open set V_q such that $x \in V_q \subseteq U$ and $q \notin clV_q$. As $skL(X\backslash U, \psi(X)^+) \leq skL(X,\psi(X)^+)$, there is a subfamily $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that $|\mathcal{C}| \leq skL(X,\psi(X)^+)$ and $|(X\backslash U)\backslash \cup\cup\mathcal{C}| \leq \psi(X)$. Let $\mathcal{D}_U = \{V_a : a \in (X\backslash U)\backslash \cup\cup\mathcal{C}\} \cup \mathcal{C}$. Then $\cap\{clV : V \in \mathcal{D}_U\} \subseteq X\backslash U$ and $|\mathcal{D}_U| \leq \psi(X) \cdot skL(X,\psi(X)^+)$. Now $\mathcal{D} = \cup\{\mathcal{D}_U : U \in \mathcal{B}\}$ has the property that $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \psi(X) \cdot skL(X,\psi(X)^+)$ and $\cap\{clV : V \in \mathcal{D}\} = \{p\}$. This completes the proof that $\psi_c(X) \leq \psi(X) \cdot skL(X,\psi(X)^+)$. □

We now present another example of a space X such that $skL(X,\lambda) < L(X)$. This example has no isolated points.

Example 3.3. We construct an example of a space X such that $|X| = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$, $skL(X,\mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega$ and $L(X) = \mathfrak{c}$. Let τ be the usual topology on $\omega^* = \beta\omega\backslash\omega$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ a base for ω^*. For $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$, we can inductively find sets C_α such that $C_\alpha \subseteq B_\alpha$, $|C_\alpha| = \mathfrak{c}$, and $\{C_\alpha : \alpha < \mathfrak{c}\}$ is a pairwise disjoint family. There is a subset $E \subset \mathfrak{c}$ such that $\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in E\}$ is a family of pairwise disjoint sets and $|E| = \mathfrak{c}$ (find an almost disjoint family $\mathcal{F} \in [\omega]^\omega$ with $|\mathcal{F}| = \mathfrak{c}$ and note that $\{cl_{\beta\omega}F\backslash\omega : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ works). Let $D = \omega^*\backslash \cup \{C_\alpha : \alpha \in E\}$. As $|D| = \mathfrak{c}$ and $|B_\alpha| = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ for each $\alpha < \mathfrak{c}$, D is dense in ω^*. Let X be ω^* with the topology generated by $\tau(\omega^*) \cup \{D\}$. The space X is not compact but is H-closed. To show that $skL(X,\mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega$, let $\mathcal{C}$ be open cover of X. We can assume that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{B_\alpha : \alpha \in A\} \cup \{B_\alpha \cap D : \alpha \in B\}$ where $A \cup B \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$. As ω^* is compact, there are finite subsets $F_A \in [A]^{<\omega}$ and $F_B \in [B]^{<\omega}$ such that $X = \cup\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in F_A \cup F_B\}$. It follows that $|X\backslash(\cup\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in F_A\} \cup \{B_\alpha \cap D : \alpha \in F_B\}| \leq |D| = \mathfrak{c}$. This complete the proof that $skL(X,\mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega$. As X has a base of size $\mathfrak{c}$, $L(X) \leq \mathfrak{c}$. The open cover $\{B_\alpha : \alpha \in E\} \cup \{D\}$ of X has no proper subcover. It follows that $L(X) \geq \mathfrak{c}$. Hence $L(X) = \mathfrak{c}$. □

To apply the Main Theorem, we need, for $A \subseteq X$, that $|clA| \leq |A|^\kappa$ where $\kappa \geq \psi_c(X)$ (cf. 1.1(e)). Usually, this is a consequence of $\psi_c(X) \leq L(X)\psi(X)$ of 1.1(a). By 3.2(b,e), we know that $\psi_c(X) \leq skL(X,\lambda)\psi(X)$ for a cardinal

$\lambda \leq \psi(X)^+$. However, for an arbitrary λ, $\psi_c(X) \leq skL(X,\lambda)\psi(X)$ is not necessarily true. For example, using the Katětov extension $\kappa\omega$ space ω, we have that $skL(\kappa\omega, (2^{\mathfrak{c}})^+) = \omega$ and $\psi(\kappa\omega) = \omega$ and $\psi_c(\kappa\omega) = \mathfrak{c}$, as noted in §1. We will use the following lemma to skirt around this obstacle.

Lemma 3.4. *Let X be a space and λ an infinite cardinal. Define $\kappa = skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)\cdot\lambda})\psi(X)\cdot\lambda$. Then for all $x \in X$ there exists a family $\mathcal{V}$ of open sets such that $|\mathcal{V}| \leq \kappa$, $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{V}$, and $\left|\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right| \leq 2^{\kappa}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in X$. As $\psi(X) \leq \kappa$, there exists a collection $\mathcal{U}$ of open sets such that $|\mathcal{U}| \leq \kappa$ and $\{x\} = \bigcap \mathcal{U}$. As X is Hausdorff, for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and for all $y \in X\backslash U$, there exists an open set $V(y,U)$ containing x such that $y \in X\backslash cl(V(y,U))$. Thus for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $\{X\backslash cl(V(y,U)) : y \in X\backslash U\}$ is an open cover of $X\backslash U$.

Fix $U \in \mathcal{U}$. Since $X\backslash U$ is closed, by 3.2(a) we have

$$skL(X\backslash U, X, 2^{\psi(X)\cdot\lambda}) \leq skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)\cdot\lambda}) \leq \kappa.$$

There exists $A_U \subseteq [X\backslash U]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that

$$\left|(X\backslash U)\backslash \bigcup_{y\in A_U} (X\backslash cl(V(y,U))\right| = \left|(X\backslash U) \cap \bigcap_{y\in A_U} cl(V(y,U))\right| < 2^{\psi(X)\cdot\lambda} \leq 2^{\kappa}.$$

Thus,

$$\left|\bigcup_{U\in\mathcal{U}} \left((X\backslash U) \cap \bigcap_{y\in A_U} cl(V(y,U))\right)\right| \leq 2^{\kappa}|\mathcal{U}| \leq 2^{\kappa}\cdot\kappa = 2^{\kappa}.$$

Let $Z = \bigcup_{U\in\mathcal{U}} \left((X\backslash U) \cap \bigcap_{y\in A_U} cl(V(y,U))\right)$. Then $|Z| \leq 2^{\kappa}$.

Let $\mathcal{V} = \{V(y,U) : U \in \mathcal{U}, y \in A_U\}$. We show now that $\left(\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right)\backslash\{x\} \subseteq Z$. Let $w \in \left(\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right)\backslash\{x\}$. As $w \neq x$ and $\{x\} = \bigcap \mathcal{U}$, there exists $W \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $w \in X\backslash W$. Furthermore, we have that $w \in \bigcap_{y\in A_W} cl(V(y,W))$ and so

$$w \in X\backslash W \cap \bigcap_{y\in A_W} cl(V(y,W)) \subseteq Z.$$

This shows that $\left(\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right)\backslash\{x\} \subseteq Z$ and thus $\left|\left(\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right)\backslash\{x\}\right| \leq 2^{\kappa}$. It follows that $\left|\bigcap_{V\in\mathcal{V}} clV\right| \leq 2^{\kappa}$. As $x \in V$ for all $V \in \mathcal{V}$ and $|\mathcal{V}| \leq |\mathcal{U}|\cdot\kappa \leq \kappa\cdot\kappa = \kappa$, the proof is complete. □

A *θ-network* for a space X was defined in [6] as a non-empty collection of subsets $\mathcal{N}$ of X such that for every point x in an open set U there exists $N \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $x \in N \subseteq clU$. The *θ-network weight* of X, denoted by $nw_\theta(X)$, is the least cardinality of a θ-network for X. It is straightforward to see that if X is regular then $nw_\theta(X) = nw(X)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let X be a space, λ an infinite cardinal, and define $\kappa = skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)\cdot\lambda})\psi(X)\cdot\lambda$. Then $|X| \leq nw_\theta(X)^{\kappa}$.*

Proof. By 3.4, for all $x \in X$ there exists a family of open sets $\mathcal{V}_x = \{V(x,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa$ such that $x \in \bigcap \mathcal{V}_x$ and $\left|\bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} cl(V(x,\alpha))\right| \leq 2^\kappa$.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a θ-network for X such that $|\mathcal{N}| = nw_\theta(X)$. For all $x \in X$ and $\alpha < \kappa$, there exists $N(x,\alpha) \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $x \in N(x,\alpha) \subseteq cl(V(x,\alpha))$. Thus, for all $x \in X$,

$$x \in \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} N(x,\alpha) \subseteq \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} cl(V(x,\alpha)).$$

Define

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \bigcap_{N\in\mathcal{M}} N : \mathcal{M} \in [\mathcal{N}]^{\leq\kappa} \right\}$$

and observe that $|\mathcal{C}| \leq nw_\theta(X)^\kappa$. If for each $x \in X$ we set $C_x = \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} N(x,\alpha)$, we see that $C_x \in \mathcal{C}$ and $x \in C_x \subseteq \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} cl(V(x,\alpha))$. Furthermore, $|C_x| \leq \left|\bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} cl(V(x,\alpha))\right| \leq 2^\kappa$.

Define $\mathcal{B} = \{C_x : x \in X\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and note that $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\mathcal{C}| \leq nw_\theta(X)^\kappa$. For all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, choose $x_B \in X$ such that $B = C_{x_B}$. We can re-write $\mathcal{B} = \{C_{x_B} : B \in \mathcal{B}$. Furthermore, since $\bigcup \mathcal{B} = X$, we see that $X = \bigcup\{C_{x_B} : B \in \mathcal{B}$ and thus

$$|X| \leq |\mathcal{B}| \cdot 2^\kappa \leq nw_\theta(X)^\kappa \cdot 2^\kappa = nw_\theta(X)^\kappa.$$

□

Lemma 3.6. *Let X be a space and set $\kappa = skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)$. Then $|X| \leq d(X)^\kappa$.*

Proof. It was shown in 3.2 in [6] that $nw_\theta(X) \leq d(X)^{t(X)}$. After letting $\lambda = t(X)$ and using 3.5, we see that

$$|X| \leq nw_\theta(X)^\kappa \leq \left(d(X)^\lambda\right)^\kappa = d(X)^\kappa.$$

□

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be a space, let $A \subseteq X$, and set $\kappa = skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)$. Then $|clA| \leq |A|^\kappa$.*

Proof. First note that $\psi(clA) \leq \kappa$, $t(clA) \leq \kappa$, and $d(clA) \leq |A|$. Furthermore, by 3.2(a), we have that

$$skL(clA, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)}) \leq skL(clA, X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)}) \leq skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)}) \leq \kappa.$$

Now use 3.6 above, where X in 3.6 is clA. □

We now apply the Main Theorem to obtain a new cardinality bound for any space X (Theorem 3.8 below). In view of the fact that $skL(X,\lambda) \leq L(X)$ for any space X and cardinal λ, this result gives an improvement on the well-known Arhangel′skiĭ-Šapirovskiĭ bound $|X| \leq 2^{L(X)\psi(X)t(X)}$.

Theorem 3.8. *For any space X,*

$$|X| \leq 2^{skL(X,2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)}.$$

Proof. Let $\kappa = skL(X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)$. We use the Main Theorem where the operator c is the closure operator cl and the expansion function h is the identity function. 3.7 guarantees that cl is an operator such that $|clA| \leq 2^\kappa$ whenever $A \in [X]^{\leq\kappa}$. As $\psi(X) \leq \kappa$, for each $x \in X$ there exists a pseudo-base $\{V(x,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ at x.

We need to verify that condition **C-S** in the Main Theorem holds. Let $\varnothing \neq H \in [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$ be such that $clA \subseteq H$ for all $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$. Observe that the fact that $clA \subseteq H$ for all $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ implies that $cl_\kappa(H) \subseteq H$. Also, since $t(X) \leq \kappa$, by 1.1(c) it follows that $cl_\kappa(H) = clH$. Therefore $clH \subseteq H$ and H is a closed set. By 3.2, $skL(H, X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)}) \leq \kappa$.

Let $q \in X\backslash H$. For all $x \in H$, there exists $\alpha_x < \kappa$ such that $q \in X\backslash V(x,\alpha_x)$. Then $\{V(x,\alpha_x) : x \in H\}$ is a cover of H by sets open in X. As $skL(H, X, 2^{\psi(X)t(X)}) \leq \kappa$, there exists $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that

$$\left| H\backslash \bigcup_{x\in A} V(x,\alpha_x) \right| < 2^{\psi(X)t(X)} \leq 2^\kappa.$$

Define $f : A \to \kappa$ by $f(x) = \alpha_x$ and observe $q \notin \bigcup_{x\in A} V(x, f(x))$. This verifies the condition **C-S**.

We conclude by the Main Theorem that $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$. □

Example 3.9. Let Z be a discrete space of size $\aleph_1$. Using a theorem of Easton[8], we show in a certain model of ZFC that

$$2^{skL(Z,2^{\psi(Z)t(Z)})\psi(Z)t(Z)} < 2^{L(Z)\psi(Z)t(Z)}.$$

Note that $L(Z) = \aleph_1$, $\psi(Z)t(Z) = \aleph_0$, and $2^{L(Z)\psi(Z)t(Z)} = 2^{\aleph_1}$. On the other hand, $2^{skL(Z,2^{\psi(Z)t(Z)})\psi(Z)t(Z)} = 2^{skL(Z,2^{\aleph_0})}$ and when $|Z| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, by 3.2(c), $2^{swL(Z,2^{\aleph_0})} = 2^{\aleph_0}$. By Easton's Theorem, there is a model of ZFC in which $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$ and $2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$ are true. In this model of ZFC, as $|Z| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, $2^{skL(Z,2^{\psi(Z)t(Z)})\psi(Z)t(Z)} = 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$. However, $2^{L(Z)\psi(Z)t(Z)} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$. □

Example 3.9 answers (at least consistently) a question asked by Paul Szeptycki during the 2015 Summer Conference on Topology and its Applications held in Galway, Ireland.

Let X be a space and λ an infinite cardinal. X is *skew-λ Lindelöf* if $skL(X,\lambda) = \omega$. Thus, X is skew-λ Lindelöf if for every open cover $\mathcal{U}$ of X there exists $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\omega}$ such that $|X\backslash\bigcup\mathcal{V}| < \lambda$. The following is an immediate consequence of 3.8.

Corollary 3.10. *If X is a skew-λ Lindelöf space then $|X| \leq 2^{t(X)\psi(X)}$, where $\lambda = 2^{t(X)\psi(X)}$.*

4. The skew-λ almost Lindelöf degree

Definition 4.1. Let X be a space, $A \subseteq X$, and λ an infinite cardinal.

(a) The *skew-λ almost Lindelöf degree of A in X*, denoted by $saL(A, X, \lambda)$, is the least infinite cardinal κ such that for every cover $\mathcal{U}$ of A by open sets in X there exists $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq \kappa}$ such that $\left|A \setminus \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} clV\right| < \lambda$. The *skew-$\lambda$ almost Lindelöf degree of X*, denoted by $saL(X, \lambda)$, is $saL(X, X, \lambda)$.

(b) For a cardinal κ, the *skew-λ almost Lindelöf degree of X with respect to $\kappa-$closed sets*, denoted by $saL_\kappa(X, \lambda)$, is defined by

$$saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) = \sup\{saL(A, X, \lambda) : A \text{ is } \kappa-\text{closed}\}.$$

(c) The *skew-λ almost Lindelöf degree of X with respect to closed sets*, denoted by $saL_c(X, \lambda)$, is defined by

$$saL_c(X, \lambda) = \sup\{saL(A, X, \lambda) : A \text{ is closed}\}.$$

Note that as $saL(X, \lambda)$ and λ are both infinite, it follows that $saL(X, \omega) = saL(X, \omega_1)$ and $saL_c(X, \omega) = saL_c(X, \omega_1)$. Useful relationships between the above cardinal invariants are given in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *For any space X and cardinals λ, κ,*

(a) $saL(X, \lambda) \leq saL_c(X, \lambda) \leq skL(X, \lambda) \leq L(X)$,
(b) $saL_c(X, \lambda) \leq saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) \leq aL_\kappa(X)$,
(c) $saL(X, \lambda) \leq aL(X)$ *and* $saL_c(X, \lambda) \leq aL_c(X)$,
(d) $saL_c(X, \omega) = aL_c(X) \geq saL_c(sX, \lambda) \geq saL_c(X, |X|^+) = \omega$,
(e) *If* $t(X) \leq \kappa$, *then* $saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) = saL_c(X, \lambda)$,
(f) *If* $saL_c(X, \lambda)t(X) \leq \kappa$, *then* $saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) \leq \kappa$,
(g) *If* $\lambda \leq \gamma$, *then* $saL_\kappa(X, \gamma) \leq saL_\kappa(X, \lambda)$, *and*
(h) *if Y is discrete space such that* $|Y| = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $saL(Y \cup \beta\omega, \mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega < \mathfrak{c} = aL(Y \cup \beta\omega)$,

Proof. The proofs of (a), (b), (c), (d), (g), and (h) are straightforward. For (e), observe that if $t(X) \leq \kappa$ then for all $A \subseteq X$, $cl_\kappa(A) = cl(A)$ by 1.1(c). If B is κ-closed, then $B = cl_\kappa(B) = cl(B)$ and B is closed. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) &= \sup\{saL(A, X, \lambda) : A \text{ is } \kappa-\text{closed}\} \\ &\leq \sup\{saL(A, X, \lambda) : A \text{ is closed}\} \\ &= saL_c(X, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Now apply (b). For (f), apply 1.1(e). □

The next Lemma is needed to insure that the hypothesis of the following Theorem is satisfied for some infinite κ.

Lemma 4.3. *Let X be a space.* $\{\kappa : \kappa \geq \psi_c(X), \kappa \geq saL_\kappa(X, \lambda)\} \neq \varnothing$.

Proof. For $\kappa = t(X)\psi_c(X)sL_c(X, \omega_1)$, $\psi_c(X) \leq \kappa$. By 4.2(d,e), we have that $saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) \leq \kappa$ for every λ. In particular, $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq \kappa$.

□

Theorem 4.4. *Let X be a Hausdorff space and κ an infinite cardinal such that $\psi_c(X) \leq \kappa$ and $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq \kappa$. Then $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$.*

Proof. We apply the Main Theorem. For $A \subseteq X$, let $c(A) = cl_\kappa(A)$. As $\psi_c(X) \leq \kappa$, for each $x \in X$, there is a family of open neighborhoods $\{B(x,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ of x such that $\{x\} = \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} B(x,\alpha) = \bigcap_{\alpha<\kappa} clB(x,\alpha)$. Let $V(x,\alpha) = cl(B(x,\alpha))$. We verify the hypotheses of the Main Theorem are satisfied, where c is the κ-closure operator cl_κ. (It is noted in [5] that cl_κ is an operator). First note by 1.1(e) that $cl_\kappa : [X]^{\leq\kappa} \to [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$. Let h be the identity function.

We verify condition **C-S**. Suppose that $\varnothing \neq H \in [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$ is such that $cl_\kappa(A) \subseteq H$ for all $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$. We show H is κ-closed. If $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ then by assumption $cl_\kappa(A) \subseteq H$. Thus, $\bigcup\{cl_\kappa(A) : A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}\} \subseteq H$. But $clA = cl_\kappa(A)$ for $|A| \leq \kappa$ by section 2, fact (c) in [5]. Thus $cl_\kappa H = \bigcup\{clA : A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}\} \subseteq H$ and H is κ-closed.

Let $q \in X\backslash H$. For all $p \in H$, there exists $f(p) \in \kappa$ such that $q \notin V(p, f(p))$. $\{B(p, f(p)) : p \in H\}$ is an open cover of the κ-closed set H. As $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq \kappa$, there exists $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that

$$\left| H \backslash \bigcup_{p\in A} V(p, f(p)) \right| < 2^\kappa.$$

Note also that $q \notin \bigcup_{p\in A} V(p, f(p))$. This verifies condition **C-S** and we conclude $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$. □

Another way of stating 4.4 is that for a space X and infinite cardinal λ, $|X| \leq 2^\mu$ for any infinite cardinal $\mu \in \{\kappa : \kappa \geq \psi_c(X)saL_\kappa(X,\lambda)\}$. The next result plays a key role in applications of 4.4.

Proposition 4.5. *Let X be a space. Then $saL_c(X, 2^{\chi(X)})\psi_c(X)t(X) \in \{\kappa : \kappa \geq \psi_c(X)saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa)\}$.*

Proof. Let $\kappa = saL_c(X, 2^{\chi(X)})\psi_c(X)t(X)$. By 4.2(g), $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq saL_\kappa(X, 2^{\chi(X)})$. By 4.2(e), since $t(X) \leq \kappa$, $saL_\kappa(X, 2^{\chi(X)}) = saL_c(X, 2^{\chi(X)})$. Thus, $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq \kappa$. □

We now establish an improvement of the Bella-Cammaroto bound that $|X| \leq 2^{aL_c(X)t(X)\psi_c(X)}$ for a space X. Observe by 4.2(c) that $saL_c(X, 2^{t(X)\psi_c(X)}) \leq aL_c(X)$ and by 4.2(g), $saL_c(X, 2^{\chi(X)}) \leq saL_c(X, 2^{\psi_c(X)t(X)})$. The following result is an immediate consequence of 4.5.

Corollary 4.6. *For a space X, $|X| \leq 2^{saL_c(X,2^{t(X)\psi_c(X)})t(X)\psi_c(X)}$.*

Example 4.7. Let Z be a discrete space of size $\aleph_1$. As in 3.9, we work in a model of ZFC in which both $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$ and $2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$ are true and show that Z satisfies

$$2^{saL_c(Z,2^{t(Z)\psi_c(Z)})t(Z)\psi_c(Z)} < 2^{aL_c(Z)t(Z)\psi_c(Z)}.$$

As $aL_c(Z) = \aleph_1$ and $\psi_c(Z) = \aleph_0$, in this model, $2^{aL_c(Z)t(Z)\psi_c(Z)} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$. On the other hand, $2^{saL_c(Z,2^{t(Z)\psi_c(Z)})t(Z)\psi_c(Z)} = 2^{saL_c(Z,2^{\aleph_0})}$. Again, in this

model and using 4.2(d) when $|Z| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, it follows that $2^{saL_c(Z,2^{\aleph_0})} = 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$. □

As $\psi_c(X)t(X) \leq \chi(X)$ for a space X, another consequence of 4.5 is: $|X| \leq 2^{saL(X,2^{\chi(X)})\chi(X)}$. As $saL(X, 2^{\chi(X)}) \leq skL(X, 2^{\chi(X)})$ by 4.2(a), we also have that $|X| \leq 2^{skL(X,2^{\chi(X)})\chi(X)}$. Compare this with the bound $|X| \leq 2^{skL(X,2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)}$ obtained in 3.8. These two results are variations of each other but neither one implies the other.

Let X be a space and λ an infinite cardinal. The *skew-λ almost Lindelöf closed pseudo-character of X*, denoted by $saL_\kappa\psi_c(X, \lambda)$, is defined as $\min\{\kappa : \kappa \geq \psi_c(X)saL_\kappa(X, \lambda)\}$. The following result is an immediate consequence of the 4.4 and an improvement of Corollary 1 in [5].

Corollary 4.8. *If X is a space, then $|X| \leq 2^{saL_\kappa\psi_c(X)}$.*

5. The skew-λ weak Lindelöf degree

Definition 5.1. Let X be a space, $A \subseteq X$, and λ an infinite cardinal.

(a) The *skew-λ weak-Lindelöf degree of A in X*, denoted by $swL(A, X, \lambda)$, is the least infinite cardinal κ such that for every cover $\mathcal{U}$ of A by open sets in X there exists $\mathcal{V} \in [\mathcal{U}]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that $|A \backslash cl \bigcup \mathcal{V}| < \lambda$. The *skew-$\lambda$ weak-Lindelöf degree of X*, denoted by $swL(X, \lambda)$, is $swL(X, X, \lambda)$.

(b) The *skew-λ weak-Lindelöf degree of X with respect to closed sets*, denoted by $swL_c(X, \lambda)$, is defined by

$$swL_c(X, \lambda) = \sup\{swL(A, X, \lambda) : A \text{ is closed}\}.$$

Note that as $swL(X, \lambda)$ and λ are both infinite, it follows that $swL(X, \omega) = swL(X, \omega_1)$ and $swL_c(X, \omega) = swL_c(X, \omega_1)$. Useful relationships between the above cardinal invariants are given in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *For any space X and cardinals λ, κ,*

(a) $swL(X, \lambda) \leq saL(X, \lambda) \leq saL_c(X, \lambda) \leq skL(X, \lambda) \leq L(X)$,
(b) $swL_c(X, \lambda) \leq saL_c(X, \lambda) \leq saL_\kappa(X, \lambda) \leq aL_\kappa(X)$,
(c) $swL(X, \lambda) \leq wL(X)$ *and* $swL_c(X, \lambda) \leq wL_c(X)$,
(d) $swL_c(X, \omega) = wL_c(X) \geq swL_c(sX, \lambda) \geq swL_c(X, |X|^+) = \omega$,
(e) *If* $\lambda \leq \gamma$, *then* $swL_c(X, \gamma) \leq swL_c(X, \lambda)$,
(f) *If X is normal, then* $swL_c(X, \gamma) = swL(X, \lambda)$, *and*
(g) *if Y is discrete space such that* $|Y| = \mathfrak{c}$, *then* $swL(Y \cup \beta\omega, \mathfrak{c}^+) = \omega < \mathfrak{c} = wL(Y \cup \beta\omega)$,

Proof. The proofs are straightforward. □

The following result provides an improvement of the Alas bound $|X| \leq 2^{wL_c(X)\chi(X)}$ for Urysohn space X as $swL_c(X, \lambda) \leq wL_c(X)$ for any cardinal λ.

Theorem 5.3. *If X is Urysohn, then $|X| \leq 2^{swL_c(X,2^{\chi(X)})\chi(X)}$.*

Proof. We apply the Main Theorem. Let $\kappa = swL_c(X, 2^{\chi(X)})\chi(X)$. For $A \subseteq X$, let $c(A) = cl_\theta A$ and $h(A) = cl(A)$. By 1.1(f), as $\chi(X) \leq \kappa$, $|cl_\theta(A)| \leq |A|^\kappa$; so, $c : [X]^{\leq\kappa} \to [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$. It is straightforward to show that the function c is an operator and h is expansive. For all $x \in X$, let $\{V(x,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be a neighborhood base of open sets at x. We need to verify condition **C-S**. Suppose that $\varnothing \neq H \in [X]^{\leq 2^\kappa}$ is such that $cl_\theta(A) \subseteq H$ for all $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$. First, we show H is θ-closed. Let $p \in cl_\theta H$, $x_\alpha \in cl(V(p,\alpha) \cap H$ for $\alpha \in \kappa$, and $A = \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$. Note that $p \in cl_\theta A$ and $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$. As $cl_\theta A \subseteq H$, it follows that H is θ-closed. To complete the verification of **C-S**, we start with a point $q \in X\backslash H$. There is some $\beta \in \kappa$ such that $cl(V(q,\beta)) \cap H = \varnothing$. For each $p \in H$, as $\{V(p,\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a base, there exists $f(p) \in \kappa$ such that $V(q,\beta) \cap V(p, f(p)) = \varnothing$. $\{V(p, f(p)) : p \in H\}$ is an open cover in X of the θ-closed set H. As $saL_\kappa(X, 2^\kappa) \leq \kappa$, there exists $A \in [H]^{\leq\kappa}$ such that

$$\left| H\backslash cl\left(\bigcup_{p\in A} V(p, f(p))\right)\right| < 2^\kappa.$$

Note also that $q \notin cl(\bigcup_{p\in A} V(p, f(p)))$. This completes the verification of the condition **C-S** and we conclude $|X| \leq 2^\kappa$. □

Example 5.4. As in 3.9 and 4.7, we will show that a discrete space Z of size $\aleph_1$, in a model of ZFC in which both $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$ and $2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$ are true, satisfies

$$2^{swL_c(Z,2^{\chi(Z)})\chi(Z)} < 2^{wL_c(Z)\chi(Z)}.$$

First note that Z is Urysohn. As $wL_c(Z) = \aleph_1$ and $\chi(Z) = \aleph_0$, in this model, $2^{wL_c(Z)\chi(Z)} = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_3$. On the other hand, $2^{swL_c(Z,2^{\chi(Z)})\chi(Z)} = 2^{swL_c(Z,2^{\aleph_0})}$. In this model, using 5.2(d) as $|Z| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, $2^{swL_c(Z,2^{\aleph_0})} = 2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_2$. □

In light of 5.2(f), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.5. *If X is normal then $|X| \leq 2^{swL(X,2^{\chi(X)})\chi(X)}$.*

6. Open Problems

In Examples, 3.9, 4.7. and 5.4, we used a model of ZFC to show that the three major cardinality inequalities developed in this paper actually improve the known corresponding cardinality inequalities. We had hope that the Katětov extension $\kappa\omega$ of ω would be the ZFC space X such that

$$2^{skL(X,2^{\psi(X)t(X)})\psi(X)t(X)} < 2^{L(X)\psi(X)t(X)}.$$

Our motivation being that $2^{L(\kappa\omega)\psi(\kappa\omega)t(\kappa\omega)} = 2^{2^\mathfrak{c}}$ whereas $|\kappa\omega| = 2^\mathfrak{c}$. However, $2^{skL(\kappa\omega,2^{\psi(\kappa\omega)t(\kappa\omega)})\psi(\kappa\omega)t(\kappa\omega)} = 2^{skL(\kappa\omega,2^{\aleph_0})} = 2^{2^\mathfrak{c}}$ is also true. That is, both cardinality bounds are excessive. We conclude this paper with the

problem of finding ZFC spaces that show that the cardinality inequalities of 3.9, 4.7, and 5.4 can be strict.

References

[1] A. V. Arhangelski, *On the cardinality of bicompacta satisfying the first axiom of countability*, Soviet Math. Dokl. 10 (1969) 951–955.

[2] O. T. Alas, *More topological cardinal inequalities*, Colloq. Math. **65** (1993), 165–168.

[3] M. Bell, J. Ginsburg, G. Woods, *Cardinal inequalities for topological spaces involving the weak Lindelöf number*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **79** (1978), no. 1, 37–45.

[4] A. Bella, F. Cammaroto, *On the cardinality of Urysohn spaces*, Canad. Math. Bull. 31 (1988) 153158.

[5] F. Cammaroto, A. Catalioto, J.R Porter, *On the cardinality of Hausdorff spaces*, Topology Appl.**160** (2013), no. 1, 137–142.

[6] N. Carlson, J.R. Porter, G.J. Ridderbos, *On Cardinality Bounds for Homogeneous Spaces and the G_κ-modification of a Space*, Topology Appl. **159**, (2012), no. 13, 2932–2941.

[7] A. Dow, J.R. Porter, *Cardinalities of H-closed spaces*, Topology Proc. **7** (1982), no. 1, 27–50.

[8] W. Easton, *Powers of regular cardinals*, Ann. Math. Logic **1** (1970), no. 2, 139–178.

[9] R. Engelking, *General Topology*, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 1989.

[10] R.E. Hodel, Cardinal functions I, in: K. Kunen, J.E. Vaughan (Eds.), Handbook of Set-Theoretic Topology, Elsevier North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 161.

[11] R.E. Hodel, *Arhangel'skii's solution to Alexandroff's problem: A survey*, Top. and its Appl. 153 (2006) 2199–2217.

[12] I. Juhász, *Cardinal functions in topology—ten years later*, second ed., Mathematical Centre Tracts, vol. 123, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.

[13] J. R. Porter, G. Woods, *Extensions and Absolutes of Hausdorff Spaces*, Springer, Berlin, 1988.

Department of Mathematics, California Lutheran University, 60 W. Olsen Rd, MC 3750, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360 USA

E-mail address: ncarlson@callutheran.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Kansas, 405 Snow Hall, 1460 Jayhawk Blvd, Lawrence, KS 66045-7523, USA

E-mail address: porter@ku.edu